# **EXHIBIT 11**

```
Page 3
          IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
                                                         1 PRESENT: (Continued)
   2
          FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
                                                         2
                                                                THE WEXLER FIRM, LLP,
   3
               WESTERN DIVISION
                                                         3
                                                                (One North LaSalle Street, Suite 2000,
                                                         4
                                                                Chicago, Illinois 60602,
   5 J.B.D.L. CORP, d/b/a
                                                         5
                                                                312-346-2222), by:
   6 BECKETT APOTHECARY, et al., )
                                                         6
                                                                MR. TIMOTHY A. SCOTT,
              Haintiffs, )
                                                         7
   7
                                                                   appeared on behalf of the indirect
                                                         8
   8
                       ) No C-1-01-704
                                                                   payor plaintiffs.
     WYETH
  10
              Defendant.
                                                        10 ALSO PRESENT:
  11 -
                                                        11
                                                                ANDREA SHEPARD, Ph.D.,
  12 CVS MERIDIAN, INC. and
                                                        12
                                                                   Principal, Cornerstone Research.
  13 RITE AID CORPORATION,
                                                        13
                                                                MR. JASON D. SMITH,
  14
              Haintiffs, )
                                                        14
                                                                   Wycth.
  15
                       ) No C-1-03-781
         VS.
                                                        15
                                                               MR. BRIAN BRUCE,
  16 WYETH,
                                                        16
                                                                   Videographer.
  17
              Defendant. ) June 17, 2004
                                                        17
  18
                                                        18
  19
            The videotaped deposition of
                                                        19
 20 KEITH LEFFLER, called for examination, taken
                                                       20
  21 pursuant to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure
                                                       21
 22 of the United States District Courts pertaining
                                                       22
 23 to the taking of depositions, taken before
                                                       23
                                                           REPORTED BY: KAY A. LEVINE, CSR, RPR
 24
           (CAPTION CONTINUED)
                                                       24
                                                                    CSR Certificate No. 84-3654.
                                                 Page 2
                                                                                                      Page 4
  1 KAY A. LEVINE, CSR No. 84-3654, a Notary Public
                                                        1
                                                                   (WHEREUPON, a certain document
  2 within and for the County of Cook, State of
                                                        2
                                                                   was marked Leffler Deposition
  3 Illinois, and a Certified Shorthand Reporter of
                                                        3
                                                                   Exhibit No. 1, for
  4 said state, at Suite 4700, 35 West Wacker Drive,
                                                        4
                                                                   identification, as of 6/17/04.)
  5 Chicago, Illinois, on the 17th day of June, A.D.
                                                             THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Good morning. We are
  6 2004, at 9:40 a.m.
                                                          going on the video record at 9:40 a.m. My name is
  7
                                                        7 Brian P. Bruce, Senior. I'm a legal videographer
  8 PRESENT:
                                                        8 associated with Esquire Deposition Services
 9
       WINSTON & STRAWN, LLP,
                                                        9 located at 155 North Wacker Drive in Chicago,
 10
       (35 West Wacker Drive,
                                                       10 Illinois. The court reporter today is Kay Levine,
11
       Chicago, Illinois 60601-9703,
                                                       11 also from Esquire Deposition Services.
12
       312-558-6113), by:
                                                      12
                                                                Here now begins the videotaped
13
       MR. GORDON DOBIE and
                                                      13 deposition of Keith Leffler, taking place at
14
       MS. PEGGY BALESTERL
                                                      14 35 West Wacker Drive, suite 4200A in Chicago,
15
          appeared on behalf of the Defendant
                                                      15 Illinois. Today's date is June 17th in the year
16
          Wyeth:
                                                      16 2004. This deposition is being taken in the
17
       HANGLEY, ARONCHICK, SEGAL & PUDLIN,
                                                      17 matter captioned CVS Meridian, Incorporated and
18
       (30 North Third Street, Suite 700,
                                                      18 Rite Aid Corporation versus Wyeth.
19
       Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17101,
                                                      19
                                                                This matter is pending in the United
20
       717-364-1004), by:
                                                      20 States District Court for the Southern District of
21
       MR. GORDON EINHORN.
                                                      21 Ohio, Western Division, and bears Case No.
22
         appeared on behalf of Plaintiffs
                                                      22 C-1-03-781. This deposition is being taken on
                                                      23 behalf of the defendant, and the party at whose
23
         CVS Meridian, Inc. and Rite Aid
24
         Corporation;
                                                      24 instance this deposition is being recorded on an
```

Page 153

- 1 degree. Could they switch some? Yes.
- Q. Well, you mentioned Kaiser earlier. Do
- 3 you think, for example, with Kaiser that they
- 4 could move share in a fairly dramatic way?
- A. Yes. Certainly as compared to a 6 typical PBM.
- Q. Right. So just as an example, would it
- 8 be anti-competitive for Wyeth to offer Premarin to
- 9 Kaiser at a deep discount in exchange for high
- 10 market share in your view?
- A. I don't know. Kaiser is probably not 11
- 12 alone enough to have any significant competitive
- 13 impact.
- Q. So if Wyeth offered essentially an 15 exclusive type arrangement with a closed plan like
- 16 a Kaiser, just sort of given the size of that
- 17 market, you're saying that might not raise
- 18 competitive concerns?
- 19 A. Probably not. I think that's what they
- 20 did, and I'm certainly not emphasizing that
- 21 anywhere in this document.
- Q. And you don't disagree that Kaiser
- 23 could then sort of switch if they wanted to and
- 24 move patients to Cenestin.

- I probably start doing analysis of the type of what
- 2 percent of the markets foreclose, the standard
- exclusive dealing type analysis, and it could or
- could not be anti-competitive.
  - Q. But you didn't undertake that type of
- 6 analysis in terms of what percentage of the market
- was foreclosed for this case, right?
- A. No, I don't view this as a foreclosure
- 9 case, or a case of exclusive dealing.
- Q. Are you aware of the amount of time 10
- 11 that it typically takes for a PBM to review a
- 12 product before they put it on formulary?
- A. Oh, I've read certainly not from
- 14 personal experience, but I've certainly reviewed 15 things that relate to that.
- Q. And have you seen the evidence that
- 17 indicates that it's typically anywhere from
- 18 six months to a year, year and a half, before a
- 19 PBM or an HMO will review a new product?
- 20 A. I'm sure it varies widely, but what it
- 21 would average, I would probably be comfortable
- 22 with that encompassing most of the cases. At the
- 23 same time I'm sure if some blockbuster drug comes
- 24 out, the review can be very quick. Or if some

Page 154

- A. I presume that at least Wyeth must have 1
- 2 felt they could, because I'm aware that the price
- 3 offered Kaiser was pretty close to marginal cost.
- 4 And so I don't think Wyeth would do that unless
- 5 they believed that Kaiser could effectively do 6 something like that, so I will go with their
- 7 judgment.
- On my own I would probably wouldn't 8
- 9- be sure I'd have to start thinking about the
- 10 doctors and what they're going to do in response
- 11 and lots of complicated stuff.
- Q. If it would be okay for Wyeth to offer
- 13 a contract like this to a Kaiser, why would it not
- 14 be okay to offer it to, let's say, a Rocky
- 15 Mountain or even somebody a little bit bigger like
- 16 an Aetna?
- A. By this you mean simply a low price for 17
- 18 exclusivity?
- 19 Q. Yes, sir.
- A. If those were the contracts at issue
- 21 here, I would do probably more typical analysis of
- 22 exclusive contracts. These are not exclusive
- 23 contracts in my mind at all, so that's not the
- 24 analysis I'm bringing to bear on it. But I would

- Page 156
- 1 drug comes out that offers tremendous cost
- 2 savings, that that process can be sped up a lot.
- Q. Now, have you factored that into your
- 4 analysis at all in terms of determining what
- 5 Premarin would have been priced at in the "but
- 6 for" world?
- A. No. I mean yes, in the extent of
- 8 that's factored in, I presume, to Wyeth's analysis
- 10 Q. But here's what I'm getting at. If
- 11 Wyeth didn't really even have to worry about
- 12 Cenestin being put on a formulary for six months
- 13 or so after they launched the product, wouldn't it
- 14 make more sense to begin the damage analysis at
- 15 six months after launch?
- 16 A. No. I mean, it might, but I don't
- 17 think it does here.
- Q. Why? 18
- 19 A. What's significant is when, at what
- 20 point, is Wyeth's pricing decisions altered
- 21 because of their recognition that they can take
- 22 actions to preempt Cenestin's entry attempts. And 23 what I've seen indicates that that occurred in
- 24 early 1999.

#### Page 157

- Q. So early '99, and you mentioned earlier 2 that that's when Wyeth had a price increase.
- A. I think in March was the actual price 4 increase.
- Q. And here's what I'm confused by. How 6 could - certainly Wyeth had whatever market power 7 it had before Cenestin came on the marketplace,
- 8 right?
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10 Q. I mean, it didn't get more market power 11 by Cenestin, one additional product joining the
- 12 marketplace, coming into the market, correct?
- 13 A. Correct.
- 14 Q. Why then does it make sense to - why 15 are you assuming that Premarin would have been
- 16 priced at a lower price at some time period before
- 17 Wyeth even had to worry about Cenestin, either on
- 18 the marketplace or being reviewed by managed care
- 19 organizations for formulary placement?
- 20 A. I think Wyeth correctly perceives its 21 pricing problem as a long-run problem, and it's
- 22 not in its best interest to exploit things on a
- 23 very short-term basis. So it's making its pricing
- 24 decisions just in the context of what's our best

- 1 otherwise.
- Let me make sure I understand this.
- 3 Your basic theory of damages is that Wyeth would
- have continued to price in the "but for" world -
- 5 let me restate it.
- 6 In the "but for" world, your theory of 7 damages is that Wyeth would have continued to
- price as it had in the past, right?
  - A. Yes, in the recent past.
- 10 Q. In the recent past. And that in the
- actual world is it your assumption that Wyeth was
- able to raise its prices because of new contracts
- with managed care organizations?
- A. Not necessarily new contracts, but that 14
- 15 through the existing contracts and the plan and
- pressure and information it was providing to the
- holders of those contracts that that was
- recognized as an effective tool in combatting
- Cenestin's entry into the marketplace.
- 20 Q. All right. And is it your belief that
- 21 Wyeth's market power actually increased after the
- launch of Cenestin?
- 23 A. No.
- 24 Q. Have you examined at all the extent to

Page 158

1 price now.

- I think consumers react and these 3 purchasers would react in a very adverse manner if
- 4 what Wyeth did is it said, Well, it's March so
- 5 we're going to jack up that price by 50 percent 6 and then we'll lower it six months later when we
- 7 need to lower it, that it's just not the way a
- 8 business firm is going to be successful in its
- 9 business relationships with its customers.
- Q. And what evidence have you seen that 11 that was, in fact, Wyeth's thinking process which
- 12 you're speculating happened, that Wyeth was
- 13 anticipating Cenestin and raising its price in
- 14 anticipation of its launch even before the product
- 15 was on the market and even before it would have
- 16 been reviewed by managed care organizations for
- 17 formulary placement?
- A. My conclusion, I think, is to the
- 19 contrary, that what happened is Wyeth recognized
- 20 that, in fact, it would be able to take actions to
- 21 increase the difficulty of Cenestin's entry and
- 22 thereby realized that the constraints that it saw
- 23 on its pricing were removed and thereby were able
- 24 to effectuate profitably higher increases than

- 1 which Cenestin may have performed better in the non-MCO and PBM sector of the market?
- A. Only the evidence that I've seen from
- Wyeth's experts. I've done no independent
- examination of that issue. I don't dispute the
- evidence that I've read from others.
- Q. The evidence that Cenestin hasn't done
- better, in fact, does worse in the cash and
- Medicaid portion of the market.
- 10 A. As I say, I haven't examined the data
- 11 itself, but I've seen what the statistics offered 12 by some certainly reasonable economist.
- 13 Q. Have you examined at all or looked at
- 14 what's happened to Cenestin's sales in the period from 2002 through the present into 2004?
- A. Again, I the most recent data I've
- 17 seen is I think ends in about '03, and that's plaintiffs' data. The IMS data ends before that,
- 19 so that's the extent of my knowledge.
- 20 Q. Are you aware of whether or not Wyeth 21 continues to have sole conjugated estrogen
- 22 language contracts?
  - A. No.
    - And so in doing a damage analysis, you

40 (Pages 157 to 160)

23

24

3

4

5

Page 189

- Q. What evidence are you aware of that
- 2 Duramed either did or didn't seek reimbursement
- 3 agreements with managed care organizations?
- A. The evidence is that I know they had
- 5 some, so they obviously accepted them if they had
- 6 the opportunity to accept them, or at least at
- 7 certain at the levels that they, in fact, had
- 8 such contracts, they revealed that they liked such
- 9 a deal.
- Q. And if the evidence indicated that, for 10
- 11 example, Duramed decided not to seek a rebate
- 12 agreement for PCS, would that impact your
- 13 conclusions in any way?
- 14 A. Not without knowing a lot more.
- 15 Q. Let me show you a document that was
- 16 previously marked as Exhibit 120. And for the
- 17 record Exhibit 120 is a document that was produced
- 18 by Duramed. And let me ask you about the first
- 19 page because it involves PCS Health Systems.
- 20 A. Yes.
- Q. And PCS is the pharmacy benefit manager 21
- 22 that was owned by Rite Aid during 1999, correct?
- 23 A. Yes.
- 24 Q. And if you look down in the fourth

- Page 191 Q. Do you - I don't think it's on your 1
- 2 list. Is it?
  - A. (No response.)
  - Q. 10733, no, it's not on your list.
  - A. Okay. I've seen things like it then,
- you know, summaries of contracts.
- Q. And looking at this, do you think it
- would be unreasonable for Duramed to seek an
- agreement with PCS, in light of the fact that its
- product was available and covered on an
- 11 unrestricted basis for 40 million of the
- 12 42 million PCS lives?
- 13 A. Would it be -- ask it -- what am I --
- Q. Do you think it would be unreasonable 14
- 15 for Duramed to take the position that it would not
- 16 seek a rebate agreement with PCS in light of the
- 17 fact that Cenestin is available and covered on an
- 18 unrestricted basis for 40 million of the 42
- 19 million PCS lives?
- A. That's certainly not sufficient for me 20
- 21 to reach that conclusion.
- Q. All right. Either way? I mean, in
- 23 other words, you don't know whether it's a good
- 24 discussion or not a good decision?

Page 190

- 1 paragraph on the very first page, it notes that:
- The coverage for Cenestin in the vast 3 majority of PCS plans without a rebate agreement
- 4 is a position few products enjoy. It is likely
- 5 that Viking Health Care Solutions will continue to
- 6 recommend this strategy in the future as it
- provides extensive Cenestin coverage with no 7
- rebate liability. 8
  - Do you see that?
- 10 A. Yes.

9

- Q. All right. Now -- and if you look 11
- 12 under 6/99, June '99, so that's down another one,
- 13 two, three, four, five -- six paragraphs, it notes
- 14 that, in summary, Cenestin is available and
- 15 covered on an unrestricted basis for 40 million of
- 16 the 42 million PCS lives, or approximately
- 17 95 percent of their book of business.
- 18 Do you see that?
- 19 A. Ido.
- Q. And looking at this document let me 20
- 21 ask you first. Have you ever seen this document
- 22 before?
- A. It looks familiar. I'd have to look at 23
- 24 the list. You probably know.

- Page 192 A. I don't -- I don't know. I'd have to
- 2 know what their market share is, what they think
- 3 their market share could be if they offered some
- 4 discount. We're basically asking can they
- 5 motivate PCS to take some actions that increase
- 6 the sales of Cenestin and then want to know is
- 7 the increased revenue from any increased sales
- more than offset by the reduced price.
- O. And you haven't made that analysis to 9 10 this point.
- 11 A. No.
- 12 Q. All right. Why don't we change tapes
- 13 here.

17

- THE VIDEOGRAPHER: This will conclude 14
- 15 videotape number two. We are now going off the
- 16 record. The time is 3:07 p.m.
  - (WHEREUPON, a recess was had.)
- THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are now back on the
- 19 record. The time is 3:22 p.m. This is videotape
- 20 number three of the deposition of Keith Leffler,
- 21 taking place at 35 West Wacker Drive, Suite 4200A,
- 22 in Chicago, Illinois, on June 17th in the year 23 2004.
- 24 My name is Brian P. Bruce, Senior. I'm

Page 193

- 1 a legal videographer associated with Esquire
- 2 Deposition Services located at 155 North Wacker
- 3 Drive in Chicago, Illinois. Counsel?
- 4 BY MR. DOBIE:
- Q. Dr. Leffler, let me follow up on a
- 6 question that you answered before the break. You
- 7 mentioned that you believe that Wyeth's market
- 8 power did not increase after the launch of
- 9 Cenestin. Is it your view that Wyeth had greater
- 10: market power in 2000 or in 1998?
- A. I'm not sure, but approximately the 11
- 12 same, but if anything, more in 98.
- 13 Q. Well, if it had more market power in
- 14: 1998, how do you explain that Wyeth didn't
- 15 increase its prices more in 1998?
- A. What's important in 1998 is its
- 17 perceptions not only of its current market power
- 18 but its anticipated future market power, and what
- 19 changed is its anticipations about its future
- 20 market power.
- 21 Q. So it's your view that Wyeth wasn't
- pricing consistent with its true market power in
- 23 1998.
- 24 A. No. It's that Wyeth is not priced

Page 195

- 1 power in 2000 or its belief about its market power
- 2 in 2000 and in the future were that it had more
- 3 market power than it anticipated back in 1998.
- 4 And therefore it set higher prices than it
- 5 otherwise would have set and that that change
- flowed from its ability to use contracts to impede
- Cenestin.
- BY MR. DOBIE:
- Q. All right. And let me make sure I'm
- understanding. Is it because of Wyeth's
- perception that it had more market power than it
- did through these agreements that allowed it to
- then raise its prices?
- 14 I believe its perception was correct,
- 15 but, in fact, it's the firm's perceptions of its
- market power which always controls their pricing.
- And that's true not only here but in every single
- case. I think, in fact, its perceptions were
- accurate, but I only use the word, perceptions,
- because that's always what we're talking about.
- 21 Q. Let me make sure I understand that.
- Are you saying that its prices were set on the
- 23 basis of its actual market power or based on its
- 24 perceptions?

Page 194

- 1 moment by moment depending upon its current
- 2 perceptions, but that it sets overall pricing
- 3 strategies based on its current and anticipated
- 4 future market position.
- Q. Well, if it had more market power in 5
- 6 1998 then 2000, then certainly it was in a
- 7 position that it could have raised or that some of
- 8 its decision to raise its prices in the period
- 92 after Cenestin was on the marketplace had to do
- 10 with its market power as opposed to the existence
- 11 of the rebate agreements, correct?
- A. I didn't get it.
- 13 Q. I mean, if Wyeth had additional market
- 14 power that would have allowed it to raise its
- 15 prices more than it did in the earlier period,
- 16; then to the extent that it later did raise its
- 17 prices in, let's say, '99 or 2000, wouldn't you
- 18 say that some of that decision to raise prices had
- 19 nothing to do with the -- its reimbursement
- 20 agreements with managed care organizations?
- MR. EINHORN: Objection.
- 22 BY THE WITNESS:
- 23 Q. Well, I believe to the contrary that 24 what happened was its perceptions of its market

- A. Prices are always based on perceptions, not actuals. Firms don't know their actuals.
- Q. If Wyeth's market power did not
- increase in the '99 to 2001 period as compared to
- 1998, what's your explanation for the increasing
- rate of price increases in this later period?
- A. A change in its expectations of reduced
- market power because of the entrance of Cenestin
- that impacted its pricing in the 98, 97 period,
- and then its recognition that, in fact, the
- reduced market power has not come to pass. And
- 12 therefore its perceptions of its market power are
- 13 higher than they were before and therefore it
- 14 reacts to that by setting higher prices.
- 15 Q. You mentioned this morning that to the
- 16 extent that there are other factors that resulted
- in Wyeth increasing the prices of Premarin apart
- 18 from the contracts, that that would not be
- 19 anti-competitive on their part.
- 20 And let me ask you about some of those.
- 21 Maybe you -- to the extent that Wyeth decided to
- 22 increase the prices of its product, Premarin,
- 23 because of the introduction of a true generic of
- 24 the product, would you agree that that's something